

ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

# Supplemental Educational Services

---

JEREMI LEARNING  
2009-2010 Program Year



Indiana Department of Education  
SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

**CEEP**  
CENTER FOR EVALUATION  
& EDUCATION POLICY

1900 East Tenth Street, Bloomington,

tel: 1.800.511.6575 fax: 1.812.856.5890 web: [ceep.indiana.edu](http://ceep.indiana.edu)

Indiana 47406

**On-Site Monitoring Report at a Glance  
For  
Jeremi Learning**

<b>DOCUMENT ANALYSIS</b> <i>*=Probation Monitoring</i>		<b>OBSERVATION</b>		<b>COMPLIANCE</b> <i>*=Probation Monitoring</i>	
<b>Tutor Qualifications</b>	<b>*Satisfactory</b>	<b>Lesson matches original description</b>	<b>3</b> (meeting standard)	<b>Criminal Background Checks</b>	<b>*In compliance</b>
<b>Recruiting Materials</b>	<b>Monitored in 2008-2009</b>	<b>Instruction is clear</b>	<b>2</b> (approaching standard)	<b>Health/safety laws &amp; regulations</b>	<b>Monitored in 2008-2009</b>
<b>Academic Program</b>	<b>*Satisfactory</b>	<b>Time on task is appropriate</b>	<b>2</b> (approaching standard)	<b>Financial viability</b>	<b>Monitored in 2008-2009</b>
<b>Progress Reporting</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable</b>	<b>3</b> (meeting standard)		
<b>Assessment and Individual Program Design</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Student/tutor ratio: <u>2-7:1.33</u></b>	<b>3</b> (meeting standard)		

*Providers placed on probation remain on probation for two years (as long as the provider meets the terms of its corrective action plan during the first year of probation). Jeremi Learning began its probation in the 2009-2010 school year. Jeremi Learning met the terms of its corrective action plan in 2009-2010. Jeremi Learning will now continue into its second year of probation during the 2010-2011 school year. If Jeremi Learning is found to have met the terms of its corrective action plan and terms of the provider's probation letter during the 2010-2011 school year, Jeremi Learning will be removed from probation after 2010-2011. However, if Jeremi Learning is found to be in violation of its corrective action plan for probation or the terms of the provider's probation letter during the 2010-2011 school year, Jeremi Learning will be removed from Indiana's provider list.*

## On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Jeremi Learning  
**REVIEWER(S):** ER

**DATE DOCUMENTATION WAS RECEIVED:** 4/6/2010

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component. The site director or another authorized representative for the provider is required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days from the time IDOE submits their request to them in writing. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers are given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory rating for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory in two or more of the following areas will be placed on probation: Tutor Qualifications, Academic Program, Progress Reporting, or Assessment/Individual Program Design.

### DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

Component	Documentation Needed	Documentation Submitted	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory
Tutor qualifications	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Tutor resumes/applications (for all tutors who work with <u>SES students</u>)</li> <li>-Documentation of professional development opportunities in which SES tutors have participated (<u>include all</u>: sign-in sheets, agendas, professional development PowerPoint presentations, etc.)</li> <li>-Tutor evaluations (<u>all SES tutors</u>)</li> </ul> <p><b>In addition to:</b></p> <p><b>ONE</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Recruiting policy for tutors (<u>one copy</u>)</li> <li>-Sample tutor contract (<u>one copy</u>)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tutor resumes and applications</li> <li>- PowerPoint presentation, Agenda from the professional development session, sign-in sheets from the PD sessions</li> <li>- Tutor evaluations</li> <li>- Sample Tutor Contract</li> <li>- Tutor recruiting policy</li> </ul>		Satisfactory

**Reviewer Comments:**

The resumes and applications submitted by the provider indicate tutors meet both IDOE's and the provider's minimum tutor requirements for education and education related experience.

All tutors have been evaluated and have completed professional development. The PowerPoint presentation and agenda submitted demonstrate the training focused on the provider's policies and procedures, curriculum and instruction, assessments, and tutor responsibilities.

The sample tutor contract is complete and stipulates the contractual requirements between tutors and the provider.

## DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

Component	Documentation Needed	Documentation Submitted	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory
Academic Program	<p><b>ONE</b> of the following:            -Lesson plan(s) from each observed tutoring session(s) on <u>(2/17/2010 and 3/22/2010)</u>:</p> <p><b>In addition to:</b>  <b>ONE</b> of the following:            -Specific connections to Indiana standards (cite exact IN standards to which lessons connect)            -Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works.</p>	<p>- Lesson plans from the sessions observed on 2/17/10 , 3/22/10, and 5/12/10            - Connections to Indiana academic standards</p>		<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>Reviewer Comments:            The lesson plans submitted include all IDOE required Lesson plan components (see IDOE's SES Policies Section 2.9). Lessons included the objective, the materials needed for the lesson, the activities that will occur during the lesson, and the corresponding Indiana academic standards.</p>				
Progress Reporting	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:            -All progress reports for <u>(two)</u> students from <u>(Michigan City)</u>, <u>(two)</u> students from <u>(School City of East Chicago)</u>, and <u>(two)</u> students from <u>(Gary Community schools)</u>:            -Timeline for sending progress reports            -Documentation of reports sent            -Copy of SES Contract with <u>(Michigan City)</u>, <u>(East Chicago)</u>, and <u>(Gary Community Schools)</u>.            -Copy of SES Agreement for the <u>(six)</u> students for whom you submit progress reports</p>	<p>- Progress Reports for two students from the following districts: Michigan City Area Schools, The School City of East Chicago and Gary Community Schools.            - Timeline for sending Progress reports            - Copy of the SES Contract with Michigan City Schools, School City of East Chicago and Gary Community Schools            -District reports on progress reporting</p>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	
<p>Reviewer Comments:            The provider submitted Assessment Reports and Individual Learning Plans as progress reports for students. While the progress reports contain some of the required components such as assessment scores and student goals, the reports are missing several additional required components (see IDOE's SES Policies Section 2.10 and Appendix F1). Specifically, the reports are missing updates on the progress students have made on their goals, specific information regarding how the student is improving his/her academic achievement, student strengths and areas in need of improvement, as well as a statement indicating that parents can contact the provider regarding recommendations about how the progress report can be improved.</p> <p>The SES contracts submitted indicated where SES tutoring would occur, the duration of programming and the compensation that the school district would pay the provider for SES tutoring.</p> <p>According to the SES Agreements, progress reports are submitted to parents and the schools monthly. However, two of the three districts surveyed shared they did not receive progress reports in accordance to the timeframe agreed upon in the SES Contract with the provider.</p> <p>The SES agreements submitted were complete, specified the content and type of tutoring that would be provided, included goals and indicated which assessments would be used to measure progress.</p>				

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components				
Component	Documentation Needed	Documentation Submitted	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<b>ALL</b> of the following: -Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student - Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plans for the (six) students for whom you submitted progress reports and SES Agreements, as long as there is at least one for each subject in which provider tutors - <u>Explanation</u> and <u>evidence</u> regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards.	- Explanation of the process the provider uses to develop Individual learning plans - Pre-assessment scores for the six students for whom progress reports have been submitted -Explanation and evidence linking the provider's assessments to Indiana academic standards	Unsatisfactory	
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The provider indicated that they develop Individual student learning plans after students take the pre-test. The results of the tests are used to determine skill gaps. These gaps are then addressed in the tutoring program. This procedure is consistent with the provider's corrective action plan. The pre-assessment scores submitted for the six students are complete and indicate that all students were administered a pre-test to identify skill gaps.</p> <p>The Individual learning plans developed include some of IDOE's required learning plan components including student goals, academic standards targeted in the tutoring program and assessment results. However, the learning plans were missing specific resources and strategies that would be used to assist the students in achieving their goals (see IDOE's SES Policies Section 2.11 (a)).</p> <p>The provider submitted a detailed explanation regarding how their assessments are aligned with Indiana academic standards and submitted a rubric listing the item numbers for a math assessment and the corresponding Indiana academic standards to which the items connected.</p>				

## On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Jeremi Learning

**SITE:** Knapp Elementary School

**TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED):** MP, AB, CM, DG

**TIME OF OBSERVATION:** 3:30 p.m. - 4:40 p.m., Note: Tutoring did not start until 3:45 p.m

**NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED:** 4

**DATE:** 02/17/10

**REVIEWER(S):** KH

During the site visit, IDOE contractors visited one or more tutoring sessions to observe the lessons that were provided. IDOE contractors looked to see that actual tutoring matched the lesson plan descriptions that were provided in the requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students were spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction was clear and understandable; that tutors seemed knowledgeable about the lesson content, and that the student/tutor ratio was in line with the provider's application.

Each provider received a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving "1 or 2 points" on any component will be placed on probation.

OBSERVATION Components				
COMPONENT	Site Visitor Rating			
	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard
1. Lesson matches original description in provider application			See page 2 of the report	
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>During the observation, students were divided into groups based on grade level (Kindergarten, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> grades). The following groups were observed: 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> grades, 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, 4<sup>th</sup> grade, and 5<sup>th</sup> grade. All students except the 2<sup>nd</sup> graders worked on language arts. Through direct instruction, students worked on their daily packet of worksheets. Tutors guided students' practice by giving them the instructions for their worksheets, and then groups who worked on language arts read a paragraph aloud, in "popcorn" style, followed by answering questions on their worksheets. The tutor read the questions to the students, and students wrote down their answers. Tutors verified that each student had the correct answer. In the group that worked on math, a tutor started the lesson by telling the students what they were to do, but then a tutor assistant took over. The tutor assistant led students through their worksheets by assisting individual students with problems. At one point, the tutor assistant used rulers to assist students in determining the number of inches in a yard.</p> <p>In addition to teacher-led instruction, the provider's application specified tutors would use Computer Assisted Instruction known as CAI. There was no evidence of the instructional strategy being used on the day of the observation.</p> <p>All packets of worksheets contained lesson plans as the first page. All groups except for the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> grade group showed the observer lesson plans for the day. The 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> grade tutor asked the observer, "What is a lesson plan?" Even after the observer replied, "A lesson plan usually contains the goal, objectives, standards, activities, and materials needed for the tutoring," the tutor did not appear to recognize that all students had lesson plans attached to their daily packets of worksheets. The lesson plans attached to the packets of worksheets aligned with the work the students completed. The lesson plans stated the goal, objective,</p>				

**OBSERVATION Components**

Indiana standards, activities, materials needed, and procedure for tutors and students. The lesson plans aligned with the sample given in the provider's application.

COMPONENT	Site Visitor Rating			
	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard
2. Instruction is clear			See page 2 of the report	

## Reviewer Comments:

Although the lesson plans given to each student clearly indicated what students were to learn, three of the four tutors did not communicate lesson objectives to the students prior to them engaging in the worksheets.

The tutors used direct instruction to give the students their assignments for the day. Tutors started off the groups by having them read aloud, and then walked the students through the subsequent questions that followed the paragraph students just read.

In the 4<sup>th</sup> grade group, the tutor attempted (students did not seem to know what was expected of them) to have the students read together in "popcorn" style, but four of the six students did not pay attention to their classmates while they read. The tutor continually reminded the students to follow along, however, it did not appear that students understood what they were supposed to do or that they were to follow along. Eventually, the tutor made one of the students move to another table where he/she was instructed to work alone on the worksheet packet. During the 15-minute period in which the student worked alone, the tutor did not check on him/her to see if he/she needed assistance on the worksheets.

In the 5<sup>th</sup> grade group, the tutor directed the students to read aloud, and then told them to write an essay about how they help out at home and why their friends should help out at their homes. After students wrote their essay, the tutor gave the students a writer's checklist which contained criteria to judge their essay. Students then critiqued their essay based on the writer's checklist, and shared findings with everyone.

In the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade group, the tutor directed the students to read a story aloud and then assisted them with correcting errors in the story. In the combined 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> grade group, the tutor instructed the second graders by telling them what they would be working on and then had them open their worksheet packet to the second page. At this point, the tutor assistant took over with assisting the students. The tutor assistant helped students circle objects on their papers that were two inches long and helped them cross out objects that were four inches long. The tutor assistant assisted a student with finding objects that were two inches long by holding up a ruler and asking the student to identify the number two on the ruler. Once the student pointed to the number two, the tutor assistant told him/her to measure the pictures and circle those that came to the two on the ruler. The aide also held three rulers together, and asked students to count the number of inches on the three rulers to figure out how many inches were in a yard. While the aide worked with the 2<sup>nd</sup> graders, the tutor worked with the 1<sup>st</sup> grade students. The tutor instructed the students to read a story entitled "Apples", and then had them answer questions like, "Many apples are \_\_\_\_\_. How can an apple help you at school?" Students were not sure of the benefits of an apple, so the tutor instructed them to reread the story looking for benefits of eating an apple. Once students finished the story and questions, students were instructed to read another story, and complete additional questions.

## OBSERVATION Components

Direct instruction was observed.

## OBSERVATION Components

COMPONENT	Site Visitor Rating		Site Visitor Rating	
	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard
3. Time on task is appropriate			See page 2 of the report	
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The tutoring session seemed disorganized and the tutoring, which was scheduled to begin at 3:30, did not begin until 3:45. Students in three of the four groups observed were on task. However, four of six students in one group were not on task. The four students socialized while their groupmates read a story aloud. The tutor repetitively asked the students to follow along with the story, but the students continually ignored the tutor. Finally, the tutor moved one student to another table and separated the remaining three students.</p> <p>In the three other groups, the students spent a majority of their time on task; however, at least one student was off task in two of these groups for at least part of the time. When these tutors noticed a student off task, they redirected the student back to their worksheets in a short amount of time. This strategy, when implemented, was effective at redirecting student behavior and keeping the group on task.</p>				
4. Tutor is appropriately knowledgeable			See page 2 of the report	
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>All tutors observed seemed to be knowledgeable in the subjects they were teaching. Tutors offered support and clarification to students who were having difficulty in completing the tasks. Tutors were observed checking students' work for mistakes and helped students with fixing mistakes.</p> <p>For example, a tutor aide worked with two second grade students on measurement. The two students could not locate two inches on a ruler, so the aide asked the students to circle the numbers 1 and 2 on the ruler. The aide explained that from the end of the ruler to number 1 was one inch, and to number 2 was 2 inches. He/she then worked with students to find pictures in their workbook that were 2 inches in length. Once students found all the two inch pictures, the aide directed students to find the number 4 on their ruler and to measure pictures. Pictures that were 4 inches in length were crossed out. This step by step procedure allowed the aide to provide assistance that met the needs of the students the aide was working with.</p>				



OBSERVATION Components

**OBSERVATION Components**

COMPONENT	Site Visitor Rating			
	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard
5. Student /tutor ratio: 2-7:1.33			See page 2 of the report	N/A
<p>Reviewer Comments: The provider application stated one-on-one (1 tutor: 1 student), small group (1 tutor: 2-4 students), and large group (1 tutor: 5-6 students) would be provided. All groups observed consisted of small group and large group tutoring and were either at or below the ratio approved in the provider's amended application.</p>				

## On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Jeremi Learning  
**SITE:** Jeremi Learning Center, 5625 Hohman Ave., Hammond, IN  
**TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED):** BD, CW, VO, MB  
**NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED:** 3

**DATE:** 03/22/10  
**REVIEWER(S):** KH  
**TIME OF OBSERVATION:** 4:20 - 5:20 p.m.

During the site visit, IDOE contractors visited one or more tutoring sessions to observe the lessons that were provided. IDOE contractors looked to see that actual tutoring matched the lesson plan descriptions that were provided in the requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students were spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction was clear and understandable; that tutors seemed knowledgeable about the lesson content, and that the student/tutor ratio was in line with the provider's application.

Each provider received a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving "1 or 2 points" on any component will be placed on probation.

OBSERVATION Components				
COMPONENT	Site Visitor Rating			
	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard
1. Lesson matches original description in provider application			See page 2 of the report	
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>During the observation, students were divided into groups based on grade level (Kindergarten, 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 6<sup>th</sup> grades). The following groups were observed: Kindergarten, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup> grades. All groups worked out of a packet of worksheets. The first page of the packet was a lesson plan which stated the goal, objective, Indiana standards, activities, materials needed, procedures for tutors and students, follow-up activity, and ongoing assignment. The lesson plans aligned with the sample given in the provider's application.</p> <p>All students observed completed worksheets that were connected to the lesson plan attached to the front of the packet. Through direct instruction, students worked on their packet of worksheets. Tutors guided students' practice by giving them the instructions for their worksheets and then letting them work on the sheets individually. In the Kindergarten room, the tutor assistant diagrammed a story on a whiteboard and then wrote a story about his/her picture. While writing the story, the tutor assistant asked students for help with spelling words in his/her story. Students were then told to draw a picture and write a story about it. As students wrote their stories, the tutor and tutor assistant helped students with spelling words and writing complete sentences. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade classroom, students were told about the assignment and given instructions. Specifically, the tutors instructed students to write a story about a friend. Once students finished writing their stories, they read them aloud. The 4<sup>th</sup> grade classroom worked on addition, subtraction, and conversion. Students added/subtracted hours and minutes together. Minutes in excess of 60 had to be converted to hours. The tutor had students complete problems individually, and then, as a group, the tutor solved each problem with the students' help.</p> <p>In addition to teacher-led instruction, the provider's application specified tutors would use Computer Assisted Instruction known as CAI. CAI was not observed.</p>				

**OBSERVATION Components**

COMPONENT	Site Visitor Rating			
	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard
2. Instruction is clear			See page 2 of the report	
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>During the observation, three of the four tutors communicated to students what they were to learn. Tutors informed students of the objective for the assignment, and, through direct-instruction, instructed the students on completing the assignment. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade classroom, students were instructed to write a story about their friends. The tutors used positive reinforcement to remind students to work quietly and diligently (e.g., "I love the way ____ is working"). When the positive reinforcement failed to reverse one student's behavior, the tutor moved the students to another table. Once separated from the group, the student completed his/her assignment correctly and on-time. When students were working hard, the tutor would tell the group to look at what the student wrote, and when students' work was not sufficient, the tutor prompted the students to write more by saying phrases like "Tell me about..." Likewise, in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade classroom, the tutor informed the students about the goal and objective associated with the assignment, and used positive reinforcement to redirect student behavior. In the Kindergarten classroom, observation of what students were to learn was not made; however, the observer did not enter the classroom at the start of the lesson. All Kindergarten students were on task and worked hard at completing their assignment.</p> <p>Direct instruction was observed.</p>				
3. Time on task is appropriate			See page 2 of the report	
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Students in all three classrooms observed were on task the majority of the time. When students deviated from the task, the tutors quickly redirected their behaviors through positive reinforcement. For example, when a 3<sup>rd</sup> grade student started telling jokes, the tutor said, "I love the way _____ is working." The positive statements redirected the student's behavior. If positive reinforcement did not work, the tutors separated students quickly, and all students went back to work fast. These strategies were effective at redirecting student behavior and keeping the groups on task.</p>				

OBSERVATION Components				
COMPONENT	Site Visitor Rating			
	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard
4. Tutor is appropriately knowledgeable			See page 2 of the report	
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The tutors seemed both knowledgeable and attentive to the needs of their students. Tutors were observed to move around the table checking each students work. When a student's essay was not sufficient, the tutor would use cues to prompt the students to write more. For example, the tutor stated to one student, "Tell me about..." a topic the student presented, but did not elaborate on in his/her paper. This tutor also assisted students with using proper grammar. When he/she would see a spelling mistake or incorrect usage of the verb, the tutor would sit with the student and work through the sentence to make it correct.</p>				
5. Student /tutor ratio: <u>5-7:1.33</u>			See page 2 of the report	N/A
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The provider application stated one-on-one (1 tutor: 1 student), small group (1 tutor: 2-4 students), and large group (1 tutor: 5-6 students) would be provided. All groups observed consisted of small group and large group tutoring and were either at or below the ratio approved in the provider's amended application.</p>				

## On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Jeremi Learning  
**SITE:** Jeremi Learning Center, 4950 Broadway, Gary, IN  
**TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED):** Mr. R, KC & TM  
**NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED:** 3

**DATE:** May 12, 2010  
**REVIEWER(S):** ER  
**TIME OF OBSERVATION:** 3:00-4:20 pm

During the site visit, IDOE contractors visited one or more tutoring sessions to observe the lessons that were provided. IDOE contractors looked to see that actual tutoring matched the lesson plan descriptions that were provided in the requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students were spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction was clear and understandable; that tutors seemed knowledgeable about the lesson content, and that the student/tutor ratio was in line with the provider's application.

Each provider received a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving "1 or 2 points" on any component will be placed on probation.

OBSERVATION Components				
COMPONENT	Site Visitor Rating			
	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard
1. Lesson matches original description in provider application			See page 2 of the report	
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The lesson plans available for review on the day of the visit were consistent with the sample lessons in the provider's application. The lessons included the objective, the materials needed, the activities, as well as the specific standards covered in the lesson. Lesson plans were attached to the student's packet of work and each student was provided with their own set of work to accomplish during the session. Although available for review, some of the older lesson plans and student packets tutors had on hand were confusing. For example, one student's folder contained a packet labeled with the student's name "Week 7" and dated 5/10, and contained material and standards for second grade, while another packet in the same student's folder was labeled with their name "Week 7", dated March 29 and contained material and standards for fourth grade. In another student folder there were packets labeled "Week 1" and dated 4/28, "Week 3" and dated 4/26 and "Week 7" and dated 5/10. Additionally, very few of the packets had been completed by the students.</p> <p>On the day of the observation, one room did not appear to begin the tutoring session with lesson plans and appropriate work for the students, however, once the monitor was introduced, within 15 minutes of the start time lesson plans and packets of work were available for the students to work on. In the interim, students were first asked to work on homework or read quietly until the materials were brought to the tutor. Once the students in this room were given work and became engaged they worked on math concepts such as rounding and decimals.</p> <p>In the second room observed, all four students were working on individual worksheet packets. At least two of the four students were working on math concepts such as place value. Another student in this room was working on initial letter sounds, but it was unclear what the fourth student in the room was working on since the tutor was not observed to be actively instructing the student at any time during the observation.</p> <p>The third room observed consisted of three students working on various math worksheets. One student was working on word problems and answering questions on currency and providing change. Although each student was working on slightly different worksheets, all students were working on math concepts with</p>				

**OBSERVATION Components**

assistance and individualized instruction from tutors.

COMPONENT	Site Visitor Rating			
	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard
2. Instruction is clear			See page 2 of the report	

**Reviewer Comments:**

Although all lesson plans had objectives listed, it wasn't always clear that the tutors informed the students what the objective of their lesson was. Some tutors were observed to state what the students were working on, but this was inconsistent between the rooms observed. In addition, in at least one room the students seemed extremely confused as to what the tutor wanted them to work on. The tutor stated that the student needed to write the "Arabic number" which only seemed to confuse the student more. This tutor also reviewed student work by collecting the work, reading the questions and responses aloud, and telling the student that they answered the question incorrectly. At no time did the tutor work directly with the student and explain the process for arriving at the correct answer. Rather, the tutor passed the packet back to the student and told the student to fix the answer. Since the students were unable to view the problem and their incorrect answer while the tutor shared which problems were incorrect, they often seemed confused as to which problem was incorrect and what they needed to do to arrive at the correct answer.

In another room, the tutor did not have lesson plans on hand at the start of the session and even stated, "I don't know what you are supposed to be working on." It appeared that this tutor didn't have a good grasp of the specific needs of the students nor what work they were supposed to be doing. Once the tutor was given the lesson plans and reviewed them, it was evident that the tutor was knowledgeable about the topics that would be covered in the tutoring session. Later in the observation the monitor returned to this classroom and it appeared that the tutor was successfully providing instruction to the entire group.

**OBSERVATION Components**

COMPONENT	Site Visitor Rating		Site Visitor Rating	
	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard
3. Time on task is appropriate			See page 2 of the report	
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In all rooms observed there was at least one student off task for a significant amount of time with little or no redirection by the tutor. Occasionally students appeared to be waiting on the tutor to receive individual attention, but tutors did not seem to provide these students with a suggestion of other material to work on while waiting their turn.</p> <p>In one of the observed rooms, students were joking with the tutor and were engaged in casual conversation with the tutor. It was clear that tutoring was not initially taking place in this room. Once the monitor was introduced to the tutor, the interaction shifted to school work and the tutor asked the students to pull out homework or read quietly. At approximately 3:35 tutoring stopped as students took a break to eat their snack. This break lasted for a few minutes, but the delivery of the snack, as well as the removal of snack waste resulted in added disruption.</p> <p>There were numerous interruptions in all rooms observed. In addition to interruptions to tutoring to provide snacks to the students, multiple sporadic restroom breaks (although of short duration) created several distractions in each of the rooms observed.</p>				
4. Tutor is appropriately knowledgeable			See page 2 of the report	
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>All tutors seemed to have the appropriate content knowledge for the subjects they were teaching to the students. Tutors seemed comfortable with the curriculum being used and could answer questions appropriately when students had difficulty. Given that all students had individual packets that they were working on, it seemed that the individual needs of the students were being met. Although one tutor commented that he or she was uncertain about the specific topics the students in their group were supposed to be working on, once lesson plans were furnished to the tutor, the tutor seemed to provide some support and instruction to the students.</p> <p>One tutor did seem to lack the appropriate knowledge of effective tutoring techniques. This tutor remained stationary for the duration of the session and appeared to lecture the students, rather than working collaboratively with them through direct instruction and circulating through the room to provide individualized attention.</p>				



OBSERVATION Components				
COMPONENT	Site Visitor Rating			
	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard
5. Student /tutor ratio: <u>3-5:1</u>			See page 2 of the report	N/A
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Small and large group tutoring was observed. This is in line with the provider's application.</p>				

## On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric COMPLIANCE Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Jeremi Learning  
**REVIEWER(S):** ER

**DATE DOCUMENTATION WAS RECEIVED:** 4/9/10

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component. The site director or another authorized representative for the provider is required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days from when they receive a written request from IDOE. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers are given a Compliance or Non-compliance rating for each component.

If a provider receives a Non-Compliance rating on criminal background checks or financial viability, the provider will be placed on probation.

COMPLIANCE Components				
Component	Required Documentation	Documentation Submitted	Compliance	Non-Compliance
Criminal history checks	<u>ALL</u> of the following: -Expanded criminal history checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees <u>working directly with SES children</u> . -Sex offender registry checks for every tutor and any other employees <u>working directly with SES children</u> .	-Criminal history checks	In compliance	
Additional Comments:				